Library Science Department
PROPERTY OF THE LIBRARY OF THE
JAN 15 1931
North Carolina College FOR WOMEN
For Building Use Only

INDIA

discussed by

DR. HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR
MISS CORNELIA SORABJI
C. F. ANDREWS
C. F. STRICKLAND

November 22, 1930

Pamphlet no. 70

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION
Incorporated
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
Eighteen East Forty-first Street
New York

New York Luncheon Discussion

Pamphlet No. 70
Series 1930-31
January, 1931

15c. a copy

D
H11
F59
no.70

Speakers

DR. HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR

Accompanied Gandhi on salt raid march

MISS CORNELIA SORABJI

Barrister, Calcutta High Court; formerly Legal Adviser to Purdahnishins

C. F. ANDREWS

Editor: "Gandhi of India," author: "India's Claim for Independence"

C. F. STRICKLAND

Indian Civil Service, retired

Chairman

JAMES G. McDONALD

Speakers' Table

C. C. Batchelder
T. A. Bisson
Brig. Gen. Frank P. Crozier
John Daniels
Syud Hossain
Dr. Kalidas Nag
Bishop Robert Lewis Paddock
Hemendra K. Rakhit
T. H. K. Rezmie
Miss Elizabeth Robins
Miss Myra A. Smith
Mrs. Gertrude Marvin Williams

Savel Zimand

INDIA

MR. JAMES G. McDONALD, Chairman

TODAY'S meeting is timely, not more timely than most F. P. A. meetings are, but just about as timely as the average. The subject is "India." There are four speakers, two Indians, two Englishmen. I am told that the two Indians will take somewhat different points of view, and I hope that the two Englishmen will.

Because we have four speakers, an unusual number, the time schedule will have to be adhered to as rigidly as ever—twenty minutes for the first speaker, fifteen for the second and third, and twenty minutes for the fourth, leaving us at the end an opportunity for a friendly, informal, round table discussion.

The first speaker is Dr. Haridas Muzumdar, a graduate of Northwestern, a Doctor of Philosophy from Wisconsin, who accompanied Gandhi on his march to the sea; and the author of "Gandhi the Apostle," "India's Non-Violent Revolution," and editor of "India Today and Tomorrow."

It is a great pleasure to introduce Dr. Muzumdar as our first speaker.

DR. HARIDAS MUZUMDAR

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am delighted to see the keen interest manifested of late by the American people in my country, particularly in the non-violent revolution for freedom which our people are carrying on.

No discussion of the India of today can be complete without a passing reference to the British Empire, and of this Empire a story is told. Once an Englishman was boasting that the sun never set upon the British Empire, to which a witty Frenchman replied, "True indeed! God could not trust the Englishman in the dark."

Whether God would or would not trust the Englishman in the dark, I, for one, would be perfectly willing to take my chances with Mr. Strickland in the dark as well as in broad daylight, because he has been seasoned by

India's salt for twenty-three long years; and, if the worst came to the worst, friends, I should be perfectly prepared to take my chances even with Indian-complexioned, Indian-dressed ladies whose favorite outdoor sport is to profess to be more pro-British than the British themselves.

The right of self-determination, ladies and gentlemen, needs no apology in this day and age, particularly in view of the World War; we all fought, over a decade ago, to end war, to extend the right of self-determination to all the nations of the earth, "to make the world safe for democracy." For the prosecution of that War India contributed well nigh one and one-half million men including both combatants and non-combatants, and close upon a billion dollars, not because we had any grudge against Germany, but because we were led to believe that the end of the War would mark the overthrow of autocracy from the surface of the earth; that it would usher in a new era, a new world order, based upon justice, righteousness, equality, self-determination.

The British politicians as usual professed those noble war aims enunciated by your late President Wilson only in order to hoodwink the world, but this time they played with fire. We earnestly and sincerely believed in the professed aims of the War, and when we discovered that England did not intend to translate her wartime professions into political realities in India, we set about the task of devising ways and means to win our God-given right of self-determination.

Let there be no mistaking: India and England are at war. In this war all the suffering is endured by the Indian people. In this war all the inflicting of suffering is done by the agents of the British government.

A parallel between the Boston Tea Party of the American Revolution and the Dandi Salt Party of the Indian Revolution of today will give you an idea of the similarities and differences between the two revolutions. The American colonists, attired in the garb of American Indians, went aboard the ship and dumped into the sea chests of tea taxed by England without their consent, indeed in the teeth of their opposition.

Clad in *khaddar,* this homespun material, and this Gandhi cap, we went to the seashore at Dandi and began to pick up salt—a free gift of nature to the people—on which the British government levies a tax of over a thousand per cent on the cost of production.

Both defied a hated tax; both strove to establish the principle: *No taxation without representation,* the difference between the two being that whereas the colonists resorted to force and violence, the Indians are today resorting to non-violence and soul force.

The colonists fought it out on the battlefields of Bunker Hill, Lexington, and Valley Forge; the Indians are today fighting it out in the prison houses, in front of the liquor and opium shops, in front of the foreign cloth dealers' shops; in a word, in the non-violent field of constructive effort and self-sacrifice.

The aim common to both is the attainment of independence. It took the colonists seven long years to have their Declaration of Independence recognized by England. It will take us a much shorter time to have our Declaration of Independence, proclaimed on the 26th of January of this year, recognized by England because the weapons of non-violence which we are using are not known to British experts on military strategy.

Under the saintly leadership of Mahatma Gandhi we have worked out the technique of non-violent revolution, of non-violent resistance, if you please. The doctrine of non-violence rests upon soul force, upon truth force, upon love force. It means that the wielder of the weapon of non-violence may harbor no ill-will toward anyone; that he ought to be prepared to go through self-invited suffering without striking back. Walking in the straight and narrow path of non-violence, we have succeeded in compelling the British government to lodge behind its prison bars over 40,000 Indian patriots, both men and women. Several thousands of our fellow-countrymen have been bodily assaulted by the police and beaten with heavy sticks. Several hundreds have had their skulls cracked open, and five hundred of the flower of India's militant manhood invited British bullets into their bare breasts in the city of Peshâwar. There were some women, too, but these five hundred men who braved British bullets, were derived from the same stock—the Mussulman and the Sikh who fought on the battlefields of France and Flanders. At the call of Mahatma Gandhi, they have laid down their arms, and instead of giving battle to the British on the plane of violence, they invited British bullets into their own hearts.

What has this self-invited suffering accomplished, you may ask. In the first place, the salt tax is as good as gone. I should feel very sorry for Mr. Strickland's present and prospective successors in the Department of Salt Revenue in India. In the second place, the prohibition of liquor and opium is being effected most successfully, thanks to the heroic efforts of our splendid womenfolk.

Let me give you two illustrations. Last year the British government realized $100,000 at the public auction where the right to sell liquor was given to the highest bidder for the district of Poona. One hundred thousand was realized last year. This year the government failed to realize $700.

Now listen to the testimony of the English editor of *The Times of India,*

which is an apologist of the British government. In a remarkable editorial entitled "A Grave Outlook," under date of September 4, 1930, the English writer says: "The lawlessness inaugurated by Mr. Gandhi (he is welcome to call it lawlessness, but we are more interested in what follows) the lawlessness inaugurated by Mr. Gandhi has resulted in serious falls in revenue, the biggest being an estimated drop of $2,000,000 in excise due to the intensive picketing of liquor shops." And the editor goes on to say, "This is a disturbing item in a budget head of revenue which does not exceed $13,000,000."

In this quotation I have taken the liberty to convert Indian rupees into American dollars. What do those figures mean? They mean one thing: As a result of four months' picketing by our womenfolk before liquor and opium shops, the Bombay government has suffered a loss of 15 per cent in its revenue derived from excise. This, of course, you would agree with me, is a very good index of the success of our movement, and yet there is a a better proof, a better index of our success. Every year India used to send out about $200,000,000 abroad, chiefly to England, for the purchase of cotton goods. In June of this year the imports of British textiles into India fell almost 50 per cent as compared with the imports for June 1929.

I shall not inflict further statistics on you. You will find them all properly recorded in my little book, "India's Non-Violent Revolution."

On the basis of the few facts it has been possible for me to present to you, I ask: Who would dare to deny that the methods of the "terrible meek" are bound to succeed?

"All the strong hands and iron heels," said Mr. Wedgwood Benn, the Secretary of State for India, significantly, "cannot compel the Indian peasant to buy British goods." And yet, the method of strong hands and iron heels is being tried every day in India by Great Britain.

The latest instance of railroading the people of India into accepting a few crumbs of bread is furnished by the so-called Round Table Conference now being held in London. The Indians at the London Conference are not there as representatives or delegates of their supposed respective groups or interests. They were not elected by any public bodies or organizations in India. They were simply nominated by the Governor-General of India, and their title to be in London today is that they are government nominees and government henchmen. Not one of them has the right to speak in the name of the Indian people. There is only one man who can speak in the name of all India, and he is behind prison bars.

I like to think of the London Conference, the Round Table Conference, so-called, not as a political gathering, but as a zoölogical exhibition. The participants therein belong not in human habitations, but in a menagerie.

I should like to have you all direct your attention not toward London, but toward the Yerawada prison house where a great saint is atoning for the sins of the British people as well as for the sins of his own people. The power of this saint's penance is great enough to influence even the wayward sons and daughters of India. The British public is flabbergasted at the utterances of Indian princes and of Indians of the moderate school of thought, as well as at the utterances of Moslem Indians now in London.

The traditional British policy of divide and rule is at last exhibited to the world in its stark nakedness. Instead of flying at each other's throats as England would have us do and as England has been telling the world we would do if she withdrew, we find the Moslem Indian joining hands with his Hindu compatriot in the demand for the immediate attainment of dominion status; and, miracle of miracles, the chief of the Indian princes proclaims to the world that the princes are Indians first and princes second; that they, too, are anxious for the immediate attainment of dominion status for all India.

It would be idle to ignore, ladies and gentlemen, that the teeth in these demands are supplied by the toothless savior of India who is at present a guest of His Majesty in the Yerawada prison house, but it is entirely a matter of indifference to us whether British statesmanship rises to the august height of Burke's speech on reconciliation or proves itself bankrupt once more as it did in the case of the colonists, and as it is doing in the case of the Palestine Mandate. So far as we are concerned, Mr. Chairman, this is a fight to the finish. No discussions in London will switch us off our main goal, which is independence.

Our peasantry is groaning under the burden of crushing taxation. The most expensive administrative machinery in the world is maintained at the cost of the starving millions of India. To cite but one illustration: The salary of the Prime Minister of England is ninety times the average income of an Englishman, whereas the salary of the Governor-General of India is over five thousand times the average income of an Indian. I want you to ponder over this staggering phenomenon.

To ease the crushing burdens of taxation on our people; to bring about free and compulsory education throughout the country; to revitalize village life by the revival of *panchayets,* our ancient self-governing bodies, the councils of the five; to take our legitimate place in the family of nations as a free people; and to contribute our full share toward the evolving of a warless world—for the attaining of these ends we mean to achieve our freedom. Ere long, Mr. Chairman, I am sure the President of the United States of America will be sending felicitations to his Brother President of the United States of India.

THE CHAIRMAN: India does not depend merely upon her men as spokesmen. We have had at different times here brilliant women spokesmen from India, and I think perhaps one of the most brilliant speeches I have ever heard in my life from man or woman was that given by an Indian woman only a year or two ago.

I am very glad that our second speaker today is another Indian woman. She was a barrister for the Calcutta High Court and an official elsewhere in India, a distinguished member of the Indian Bar. It is a great pleasure for me to introduce to you as the next speaker, Miss Cornelia Sorabji.

MISS CORNELIA SORABJI

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I have been asked to speak to you today about the work of the British in India and I have only fifteen minutes in which to do it, so I propose to take for granted a great deal of the information which I would otherwise have given to you as background to what the British have done in India.

To begin with, we must remember that England has given us more than one hundred and fifty years of peace, after close upon two thousand years of war; and she has given to us also the works of peace. We are a divided people. There are 320,000,000 of us, 200,000,000 of which are Hindus and 70,000,000 Mohammedans, to name only the two chief divisions. There are other races and subdivisions of races. There are nine chief religions represented in India, and we speak two hundred and twenty-two different languages.

The first thing that I should like to notice as the gift of Great Britain to us is that she has evolved *cement* which might bring together the various peoples of India; a common language has proved cement of that nature. The schools teach each person his own vernacular if he cares to learn it; but he may also learn the common tongue which is English.

Secondly, she has given us a mileage of railways which is comparable to your mileage in the United States, 40,000 miles of railway. The railways bring together the different peoples of India, and in the common adventure or the common discomforts of a railway, different people, people from different parts of India, find an opportunity for intercourse; and you know it is quite true that we only want to get rather nearer to each other to know what nice people we are all the world over; and we are learning that in India by reason of the British.

Then England has given us *equality*. I should like to remind you of Queen Victoria's Proclamation, the first utterance of democracy ever made

in my country. She said that every individual was equal to every other individual, British to Indian, and Indian to Indian. Equality of opportunity was what she gave to us. You must remember the background to realize the nature of that gift. You must remember that the Emperor Aurungzebe had smashed Hindu temples with a suffragette's hammer and that the last Moslem rulers had exacted a tax—the jizzia—from every person not a Mohammedan, because he was not a Mohammedan.

That is all rubbed away now. Every person is equal to every other person. Again, in regard to caste, or the subdivisions of the Hindu peoples you know all about that. Caste began as an economic arrangement among the people who came to India as Aryans. They divided themselves into those who prayed and were learned; those who fought; those who tilled the soil; afterwards, the occupations all grew out of the third class: outside those who served these four castes every one was outcast. Persons not born of the priestly caste could not become learned. Persons not born fighters could not fight. . . . Under the British, anybody may be learned, may occupy any position he pleases, may adopt any occupation he pleases. We have equality of opportunity; and I know no other definition of democracy but that.

Then the second part of the Queen's Proclamation gave us individual liberty. The Hindus and the Moslems were allowed their personal religion in regard to inheritance, marriage, and succession. That is a tremendous gift, and had I time I should have liked to have exemplified what that means to us; but you must just study that for yourselves. I am hoping in the few words I will say to you to put you upon your own inquiry in regard to the things that I cannot elucidate here.

Then she gave us the best administrative system in the world. It begins with a tiny circle which includes the peasant; the *panchayets* to which references have been made, have been revived, but revived with a wider implication than was applied to them originally. The *panchayets* in old days dealt in the villages with the straying of a neighbor's cattle and the boundaries of a neighbor's field. Now the people on the *panchayets* are being taught the civic sense, to care about drains and sanitation, about health and schools.

The British system of administration then begins with a subdivisional officer down at the bottom, goes through a wider circle under the control of a collector, a wider circle still under the control of a commissioner, and is finally tied up to the provinces and through them to the central government.

Great Britain has given us an administration and a judicial system side by side with it. I can speak with knowledge of the judicial system in India; and I think I need only say that it has changed the meaning of the

word "justice" in India. Justice is no longer "the will of an individual." There is justice for all alike.

The door thus set open to equality between man and man and to liberty, has been pushed further and further open through the years. In 1861 we got the Councils Act admitting Indians to serve in the Legislative Council. In 1892 the Councils were enlarged and the people made laws. By 1909 not only did the Indian people sit in the Councils and help make the laws of the country; but they were also allowed to criticize the policy of the British government even as to finance.

In 1919, under an Act which you have often heard discussed, the greatest advance towards independence was given by the granting to us of representation. Up to this time the administration whether Indian or English was responsible to the British Parliament but not to the Indian people. In 1919 an electorate was created in India so that we are now responsible directly to the Indian people. The difficulty of creating an electorate has been very great; but it has been overcome. I will tell you only one thing which will help you to gauge this difficulty. The constituencies vary from 6,000 square miles to 60,000 square miles per man; and the situation has been complicated by our illiteracy.

The reforms which are foreshadowed in the report of the Simon Commission go further still. We are to have autonomy in the provinces, (we may have more than the details of the Report give us) and a federal central government. The electorate will be enlarged.

So far for Great Britain's personal and administrative gifts, but gifts of this nature would have been of little use if we had not been equipped for taking those gifts; and England has given us *equipment.* She has given it by her educational system. There was no such system in India when it was taken over. She has given us laws, and a system of justice, health, and sanitation.

There was no common ideal of health and sanitation in India before. To the Hindus disease was the occupation of an individual by demon or god. England has given us one standard about health and sanitation, and one standard about justice; one standard of honor; she has given us one standard in regard to all the machinery which is needed for a forward-moving country.

We have our universities. We have our medical research institutes. We can become lawyers, doctors, and agriculturalists. We have our commercial and industrial schools. We have, in fact, everything which is needed for the machinery of a going concern, and we have it all at the point of perfection to which England brought it in her own country when

she gave it over to us. We have had no fights over things we wanted for our progress.

I will take only one illustration. I have been sitting lately on the Labor Commission in India, and I have for long visited the mills roundabout where I live. We have factory laws and trades union laws and all the labor legislation which England has fought for over a hundred years. We have all that ready-made.

There is a great deal more I could tell you about what England has given us. I want you to think for a moment of the handicaps she has had in giving us these things. We have talked about caste. It is a terrible handicap. We have talked about the opposition, the animosity, the radical animosity between Hindu and Moslem. All these things will persist when the new government takes over from the British government, and all these things will be exaggerated, because they will be people in these opposite camps who will administer the country, not the people from outside.

We still have our Hindu-Moslem troubles in India, and that is a very difficult question. Remember, to the Hindu the cow is an object of worship; to the Mohammedans it is an article of diet. The Moslem was the last person who ruled in India. When Hindu and Moslem are in the government, memories will awake. The Hindu is a dreamer and you admire him for that. The Moslem is a statesman.

Then take caste; you know what the outcast has suffered in India. You have often heard about it in this country. Remember that the British first rubbed away the distinction between the caste man and the outcast, and owing to that fact, a man who is of no caste is a guest in the Palace of St. James now, and is heard with acclamation and received with honor by the British people. Outcasts have held office and will hold office in our administration and government and public services. There are more Indians than English in our judicial service, more Indians than English taken all over India on our high court bench; Indians in every service in the country, and in the highest posts in these services. But we were told by Dr. Ambedkar at the Conference that he has a promise from the progressive Indians who attend the Conference that the outcast will be treated equally with the caste men in regard to the use of caste wills, and the entry to Hindu temples in the new government. What are we to say? Just remember that Hinduism is caste. There is nothing else to it, and that the Hindus who are in England now are not Hindus as the orthodox majority regard Hinduism. They are not orthodox Hindus. They do not observe caste; therefore for that reason alone they are themselves outside the pale. They are out-of-caste.

What would you say to the Roman Catholic who became Protestant and

promised you there would no longer be a Pope? Could he keep that promise? That is exactly the situation in regard to the proposition made by Mr. Sapru and others of the progressive Hindus born of the Hindu race but not regarded by orthodox Hindus as now being Hindus by religion. And the questions raised by Dr. Ambedkar and many more are all religious questions.

The chief difficulty to my mind will be between the progressives and the orthodox. The progressives have thrown away everything that ties and binds them. The orthodox cling to these things. They are matters of religion. How can the progressives interfere with these?

Finally, before I must close, I want to say two things: I want to remind you of an accident in a street, if you have ever seen one. Why does the accident occur? Because people are going at different rates of progression. That is our position in India. There are three rates of progression at which we travel. First there are the emancipated who have thrown away everything, who are as aliens are in India in regard to custom and progress in a modern world. Next there are people in between who are moving forward, but have not yet thrown away everything; lastly there are the orthodox. We may compare them to the traffic in a street—the Rolls-Royces, the horse carriages, and the ox-carts. The ox-carts are in the majority, and accidents must happen because of our different rates of progression; especially when there is no policeman to control the traffic.

Finally, let me tell you the story of two men on a river steamer. One was an extremist, the other a moderate who desired independence but did not desire warfare and did not use slogans and only slogans for his arguments. The extremist was using a slogan. He said, "You cannot learn to do a thing without doing it."

The other man said, "Right. You cannot learn to manage this boat without managing it. Take the wheel away from the pilot."

You know our rivers close by Calcutta are very difficult to navigate. "Take the wheel away from the steersman," he said.

"I can't do that," said the extremist. "My family is on board."

That is our position in India. Our families are on board and we cannot immediately and in a moment do without an experienced steersman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now that we have heard the Indian point of view from two speakers who agree so completely, we will proceed to hear the English point of view from two speakers who I imagine will agree nearly

as completely as they. The first of these English speakers is an old friend of ours officially and, I am happy to say, an old friend to many of us personally.

The British are a great people, but we think of them usually as administrators and those who do what the British consider justice throughout the world and what many other people consider justice, too, but there is another type of Englishman who does something else when he goes abroad and that type of Englishman is our first speaker, an old friend of Mahatma Gandhi, an old friend of Mr. Tagore, the author of "India's Claim for Independence," the author of "Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas," and the editor of "Gandhi of India." I am sure you will all agree with me in welcoming Mr. C. F. Andrews as our next speaker.

MR. C. F. ANDREWS

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I shall avoid the acute temptation to answer point by point the things brought forward by the last speaker, and keep to the positive side of my arguments and hope that that as a whole will be the real reply to much in it which I regard as mistaken.

Only one point I must protest against immediately and that was her sentence concerning one of the greatest religions of the world, Hinduism, that there is nothing else in it except caste. She said caste is Hinduism as it were; there is nothing else in it. I do protest as one who has studied this great religion at first hand nearly all my life that that is entirely a wrong conception of one of the greatest and noblest religions in the world.

My positive argument today for Indian independence is taken from Sir John Seeley, who wrote, fifty years ago, a very great book called "The Expansion of England," and in that "Expansion of England" he regarded India as the largest and most prominent field, but in his amazingly frank statement he gave us two definite propositions which he regarded as axiomatically true.

The first was this: That prolonged subjection to foreign rule is one of the most potent causes of moral deterioration—a terrible sentence for a foreign ruler to contemplate, but one which history has always proved to be true.

Let me point to that word "prolonged," for I would be the last to say that English rule in India in its earlier days, especially during the great days of the Nineteenth Century was a cause then of moral deterioration. It had the opposite effect. It did awaken India in a marvelous way to see

the decay into which she had fallen; but while the galvanic impact of a foreign rule could do this, it could not by itself do away with those evils, and it is true that as the foreign rule is prolonged, there is a sapping, an undermining of character; there is a creation of a dependent attitude of mind, which is altogether morally unhealthy; and the very first thing that Mahatma Gandhi had to do when he came as a great revolutionary was to get rid in India of what he called the "slave mentality" caused by foreign rule.

No one who has not been in India can realize what it has meant to have this continual state of subjection, subservience, dependence, leading on to a sapping of the inward character. That is the terrible thing that has resulted under foreign rule.

The second of Sir John Seeley's axioms is a corollary of the first. He says: "We have already weakened India and it is to be feared that every year our rule continues she will grow more and more weak and dependent."

That was written fifty years ago and it is thrown in the teeth of Indians today that they are unable to defend themselves and must rely on the British protection, but I would ask the further question: Who has made that dependency? Who has caused that state of dependence? Surely it is the prolongation, the far too long prolongation of the rule of the foreigner in India.

I, as an Englishman, love liberty with all my heart. As an Englishman I detest to see my country involved in the continuance of a state of dependence in any part of the world over which England has rule and dominion and as Englishmen, we are absolutely obliged (I speak it on behalf of my own country and I would say on behalf of the great majority of my own country) and we must earnestly try to get out of this vicious circle which has been far too long enfolding and entangling and embracing India in its coils and give, nay, not give, because it can never be given, but allow India herself to attain her own freedom; and that is being shown, I think, every day by Mahatma Gandhi and those who under him in a most marvelous manner have kept non-violent in the struggle and are showing by suffering and by incomparable bravery of bearing blows rather than dealing them, that they are worthy, morally worthy of responsible government.

The last speaker has given us the blessings that have accrued to India under British rule and I would be the last to decry them, but she has not shown what has really taken place under the same British rule and what is really and truly increasingly taking place unless the British give the responsibilities of the government of India into the hands of the people of India themselves. Let me mention them one by one.

Education: Could anything be more pitifully a failure than the edu-

cation that is seen in India today, where only 5 per cent of the people are even literate? It is a terrible tragedy today that we witness, that that whole country which has an intellectual past quite in the highest ranks of mankind, is, after a hundred and fifty years of British rule, in this miserable state of illiteracy and ignorance.

Take again the poverty of India, due undoubtedly to the incidence of taxation and especially of the land tax.

Let me read you one single sentence from an Indian civilian, C. J. O'Donnell, who along with Sir Richard Garth, Chief Justice of Calcutta, Sir John Jardine, Judge of the High Court of Bombay, Sir Henry Cotton, Governor of Assam, Sir William Wedderburn, M. P., and eight others of highest official rank, petitioned to the Indian government. Their petition may be summarized in a sentence: "They prayed that the demand of land revenue should not exceed one-half of the net profit of each estate or farm; that is, that it should not exceed a 50 per cent income tax."

How can a people rise from poverty, how can the 90 per cent of Indians who are villagers, rise from poverty when that taxation is placed upon them, and there is one of the great miseries of Indian rule today.

I am a villager, not a townsman. I live in the villages. I love the villages of India, and there is one in this city, Gertrude Emerson, who has lived in those villages and she has just brought out a book called "Voiceless India," which voice gives their cry. Read that book and see how terrible is the poverty of India.

Then again there is one more serious evil which is ever increasing and, alas, has come to a head only quite recently, and that is racial discrimination.

Our speaker spoke about justice, but there is one part of Indian administration where justice, alas, between man and man, is not observed, and has not been observed for fifty years, and that is where the Englishman is involved, for there the question of race again and again obliterates justice and makes justice a mere farce. It is that terrible injustice of racial prejudice which is continually making the atmosphere of India and of Indians wherever they are throughout the world, grow worse and worse, more and more cloudy. That racial discrimination is not diminishing. Even in England, alas, it is increasing; not diminishing. In the Dominions it is increasing.

I have to start on Wednesday for South Africa because in South Africa the Indian community is going to be racially discriminated against by an iniquitous segregation bill, and I have been called by the Indian community with a piteous call to go out to help them in their struggle to avoid being

placed on a lower level and discriminated against in the Transvaal. And that is there in spite of the Queen's Proclamation of 1857. That is there in this year 1930, and over and over again we have felt the stinging insult of racial discrimination.

If anyone wants to know what it is, let him read Lieutenant-Colonel Osborne's book "Must England Lose India?" The answer to that question which Lieutenant-Colonel Osborne gives is that England must lose India if this racial discrimination continues any longer to insult the most patient people in the world.

I have only one more minute to close and I want to go back in that to the very last time I spoke from this platform, and I gave the five points of Mahatma Gandhi's program. Let me go over them again and see how marvelously forward they have gone in the interval of a year and a half since I spoke from this very place.

First the removal of untouchability. You cannot imagine how far that has gone in the interval. You cannot imagine how deep the cry has gone for equality there. Read that speech only lately in the Round Table Conference and you will see Hindu and Moslem unite. That again has gone a long step further forward.

The middle point of his program was equality of women and men, the woman's cause. Today the women are leading the Indian revolution. The women themselves are in the forefront of the great battle, prohibition of drink and drugs. We have had some statistics and we know that that is being carried out by the will of the people themselves who are determined to get rid of these things, these evils, from their country.

And, lastly, the *khaddar* program, the program of the villages, the introduction of home spinning and home weaving into the villages.

I have a letter here from Mira Bai, one of the saints of the earth in India, in which she says that the progress made in the last six months in villages in encouraging home spinning and home weaving has been equal to six years before and that it has grown beyond all human calculation.

There, then, we see how Mahatma Gandhi's own positive program has gone forward. Why? Because the people of India themselves now are no longer servile, no longer subject, no longer dependent, but they are morally independent owing to the great inspiration of the great leader, and that moral independence is the sure and certain pledge that they will get their political independence, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: The fourth and last speaker for the discussion period is in this country under the auspices of the Foreign Policy Association, speaking on India. He is not our only speaker on India. Mr. Strickland would be the last person to say that he could tell all there is to be said about India, but we are very glad in this crisis that Mr. Strickland is here and particularly glad that he is here now to finish the formal part of the discussion.

For twenty-three years Mr. Strickland has served in the Indian Civil Service as Magistrate, Judge, Revenue Officer, Collector of Income Tax, and later Commissioner of the Northern India Salt Revenue. I am sure you will all feel that Mr. Strickland speaks to us out of a wealth of experience and knowledge which makes him especially welcome today. Mr. C. F. Strickland!

MR. C. F. STRICKLAND

LET ME from the beginning make clear the point of view which I wish to represent to you. I have not the faintest intention or desire to oppose in any way the advance of India towards self-government; and in the future when all her people are educated and able to express an opinion, when *all* her people, not merely a little group at the top, are in a position to express their opinion freely, if then she demands independence, she will stand in exactly the same position as any other British Dominion, and that is the view of the great mass of the British people. It is the view also of the great majority of the British administrators in India.

That is a point of view that I feel you may not have fully understood, and certainly it has not been levelly placed before you by those who have spoken to you on the other side. It has been represented by implication, if not by statement, that the attitude of the British administrator in India and possibly of the British public in England, is one of grudging and adverse yielding of ground, step by step. Not in the least!

It has not been a hundred and fifty years, as Mr. Andrews suggested, that the British government and the British authorities have held control of India. If you study a map, showing the growth of British power, you will find that is totally incorrect. The British government has actually had full control of India for only seventy years, since the Mutiny. If you look on the back of the programs in front of you, you will see how large are the areas of the States even now outside British control.

For seventy years the British authorities in India have steadily trained the people to manage their own affairs. I will not go through, it is unnecessary, the details of what Miss Sorabji described to you, the various

steps by which Councils have been created and representation has been given. I will only say this, that we are now confronted, both in England and in India, with the greatest opportunity for a peaceful solution of an enormous problem which has ever faced any people finding themselves, rightly or wrongly, in the government of another.

Courtesy of British Library of Information

I look forward, as I believe do all liberal Englishmen, including the administrators in India, to a peaceful and happy solution of the Round Table Conference in London, which will, I am glad to think, ignore the vaporings of those extremists in India or elsewhere, who continue in spite of the importance of this Conference, to express misleading opinions as to the value of those who are there represented.

Dr. Muzumdar maintains, and quite truly, that those who are there are not elected. Nor are the British delegates. Have you realized that? Who is to elect the Indians? Are you to have a general election? That would only give you representation of a limited electorate. Dr. Muzumdar means, of course, that those who should have been sent there should have been elected by the Indian Congress, which now is almost entirely a Hindu body with only a small following of Moslems, and which does not by any means represent all the Hindus of India, nor the masses of the country at all.

It would have been a deplorable event if the authorities in India had recognized nominees or elected representatives of the Congress alone, that is to say of the extremists, as those with whom they were to discuss the future of India. We have far better men there, men of good will, men of level minds, many of them of equable temper, who will do, I believe, what Mr. MacDonald, the British Premier, has asked them to do; they will leave the generalities upon which they have found an agreement—an excellent thing that they have found an agreement on generalities—and instead of merely asking for dominion status or full self-government, will come down to the actual difficulties of constructing that constitution.

Have we heard a word of these actualities from Dr. Muzumdar or Mr. Andrews? Not a bit of it. Their argument is all up in the air, all emotion, genuine emotion I am sure, but emotion only.

The British government in India is now, I firmly believe, about to crown the efforts of sixty or seventy years in training the Indian people by discussing peaceably with them at a Conference in London the actual working details of a constitution for India which will satisfy all except two groups: (1) the British diehards; and (2) the Indian diehards.

Ignore them both. In either case they represent a small minority, noisy, active, possibly even in England prepared to suffer imprisonment. I should like to imprison some of them in England, but in any case they do not represent the liberal, level-headed bulk of the country which wishes for India peace, good administration, and contentment, and which does not believe that these can only be given by maintaining unchanged the control in the hands of the British Civil Service in India.

We have, however, to face the practical difficulties, and it is precisely

because they are afraid to face those difficulties, that the extremists have refused to go to London. If they were there, their bluff would be called. They would be told to put on the table their constitution. They could not do it. Some of them tried to produce a constitution two years ago in India and it was promptly rejected as being a pro-Hindu document. It was rejected by the Moslems and other communities forthwith.

It is good news that those who have gone to London are in agreement, at least in principle. Now let them sit down and discuss the details. The princes, too, are in agreement with them. Yes, the representatives of British India have obtained agreement with the Indian states at a price, at a price which I myself, as being somewhat more nationalist than many of those Indian Nationalists, am reluctant to see paid; that is to say, the Indian states, having come into a federal government, will, of course, be able to snap their fingers at any person in India or in England, who tells them they must modernize their government.

There is another matter. If the Nationalists are content with that position concerning the States, let them be, but they have not yet dealt with the army. Mr. Andrews quotes something from Professor Seeley, written fifty years ago, you remember; he told us that, of course, but it is a very different position now. When Professor Seeley wrote, it was the case that a number of persons in England and many in India looked upon an indefinite continuation of British rule in that country. There is only a negligible section which now wants that to remain the position; and to suggest, as was implied, that the opposition of Britain to Indian self-government was an unworthy attitude, a deplorable one anyway, and one causing further deterioration in India, is, in my opinion, altogether misleading.

We want to see India self-governing, but we are not prepared to fly in the face of facts. She is unable to defend herself, I am told, because we have caused her to become weak. Did she defend herself during those hundreds of years when invasions swept down from Central Asia and massacred, and pillaged, and destroyed everything that came in their path? There was no protection of India by Indians then. The only instrument forged of Indian men that has been able to protect India is the Indian army with the British stiffening which is now defending its frontiers. I look forward to a gradual Indianization of that army so far and so fast as it can safely be done. Do you know that it is being done? Nobody tells you that. It is being done steadily year by year. The beginning is only small, but steady progress is being made, and it would be madness, madness and the gravest dereliction of a national and international duty to hand over an imperfectly tempered instrument, an imperfectly tempered sword to those whose hands are not yet strong enough to wield it. Let us do it, but with caution.

Most of all I wish to call before your minds the picture of the Indian peasantry, the three hundred millions, illiterate, that is quite true, and indifferent to all the noise of politics except when a special attack is made by political leaders upon a special area, and then they are stirred up.

I do not wish to deny that in certain parts of Bombay the followers of Mr. Gandhi have succeeded in making the peasantry for the time-being hostile to the government, and causing them to refuse to pay their land tax. They are poor, and because they are poor they fly to every means by which they can escape some of their taxes; such means are naturally welcome; so they are to me and to you.

What is their wealth and their standard of taxation? According to the best estimates, $150 per annum is the income of an Indian family, and the taxation is $7.50. Compare that with the Philippines $15, Japan $45; for these countries I am taking a family of five, but for the United States and Great Britain let me reduce it to a family of four, and you have in the United States a taxation of $180, and in Great Britain $332. Compare that again with the Indian figure of $7.50 as the total taxation of a family. Is the country groaning under impossible burdens?

Speaking of the land tax which is so terribly heavy, how heavy is it? Thirty-two cents per acre. I don't think that is very, very terrible. If we can remove it, let us remove it. If we can abolish the salt tax, by all means let us do so. If by any effective means (and there *are* difficulties) we can secure prohibition of liquor and opium, then let us do it. And if also we can introduce compulsory education all over India, or if Indians themselves under a self-governing administration can do it, then all to the good, but how are you going to balance your budget?

You have abandoned the salt tax, twenty-six million a year. You have abandoned liquor. If you establish an adequate prohibition staff, it will cost a hundred million dollars per annum, and compulsory education again a hundred million per annum. Where will you save it? Cut half the cost of the army? That is a great extremist proposal; cut half the cost of the army, a mad scheme, and see Central Asia pouring down into the peaceful villages of India. That is what the constructive makers of modern India, the extremists, offer to the world, and to the British people from whom they are demanding self-government.

That is not the attitude, I hope, of those who have gone to the Round Table Conference. The men at the Round Table Conference represent everything in India worth while, except the extremists. I do not say *they* are not worth while. They are an important Nationalist party. I sincerely regret they have not gone to the Conference, but we have more hope of agreement without them, more hope of agreement in the Round

Table Conference if the diehards are left out; and when that agreement is presented to the British and Indian peoples, I firmly believe it will be accepted and that the diehards will dwindle.

The Indian peasant is a simple but a lovable man. My work has lain amongst the villages for years and years. He is uneducated for two reasons: first, that until quite recently there has been no considerable demand (there is now) for education for boys and girls; and, secondly, that we find to introduce that education will cost a hundred million dollars a year and if you are going to do that, then you must tax the country. Where is the money to come from if you don't tax?

Dr. Muzumdar speaks of the most burdensome administration in the world, the most expensive. Do you know the cost of that administration? He means, of course. that it is manned by highly paid Europeans. If you look at the Simon Report, a comparatively veracious document, you will find the total number of the Indian servants of government given at one and one half millions. I question that figure. I think it is too high. Take it at one million. How many of those are Europeans? Twelve thousand. Now come to the higher posts at the top, the superior services, 5,250 all together, of which 3,500 are Europeans, and the rest Indians; one third, therefore, of the higher service is already Indian, and if you were to cut, as has been suggested, half the pay of both the British and Indians in the higher services, you would save only $15,000,000 a year.

It is at the price of that $15,000,000 that India has an administration composed of human beings, faulty, with many defects as in every other nation, but who have at least done their best to be impartial in the country, to be fair to the weak as well as to the strong, and who have above all raised and given the chance of rising to the outcasts and backward tribes, some sixty millions all together, who under the old system of Hindu government and even under the Moslems also, had very little consideration and no privileges at all.

It is quite true that the outcasts have still a long road to travel. It has been suggested, not here, but in the Round Table Conference the other day, that they have not been admitted to the army. It is not true. I watched their recruiting myself; not in the south, not where the Madrasis come from, because other Madrasis also have for the most part not been admitted to the army. They don't happen to be that type, but I have seen it in the north where the outcasts were being recruited. That has been the effort of our administrators in the past and will be the effort of such of them, if any, as may remain in the future; the effort to be fair to the weak as well as the strong; not to hand over the whole government to a group of educated men (though I admit the educated man is more important, number for number, than the uneducated,) but to hand over the

country, if possible, to a just administration in which the peasant, above all, will have a hearing. It is the peasant with whom these urban educated men have very little sympathy, only sympathetic words. I want a government in which that peasant will be able to make himself felt and will not feel in parting from the British he has parted from all that made his life secure and worth living.

THE CHAIRMAN: At this point I am going to violate one of our usual regulations and permit two five-minute rebuttals, five minutes to Dr. Muzumdar, and five minutes to his fellow countrywoman whom he so much admires, but before he begins, I have been reminded by our Speakers Bureau that not only do we manage Mr. Strickland, but we also have the great honor of making Dr. Muzumdar available to audiences.

DR. MUZUMDAR: You would agree with me that I was not ill advised in trusting Mr. Strickland. He has given you a very fair and accurate account of India's indictment of British rule. The figures he has quoted I need not requote, but on the basis of those figures I shall make out the case of the Indian Nationalists.

To begin with, may I take up a few points, item by item, so there may be no emotion but there may be facts which are bound to stick in the heads of people.

In the first place, the Queen's Proclamation which contained promises of equality and individual liberty, is a dead letter so far as India is concerned. Mr. Strickland himself admitted that at the end of seventy years' rule in India, Britain has succeeded in having only one-third Indians in the superior services, two-thirds being British; and let me assure you, my friends, the Indians in India sometimes are ten times as brilliant as the Englishmen who come out to our country.

In the second place, in regard to the many languages that the Simon Commission Report discovered, and which my dearly beloved Miss Sorabji pointed out to you. Until yesterday they were telling us there were only dialects in India, there were no languages when they wanted to cry down Indian culture, and today we discover a little dialect is dignified with the term "a language," so you have ten or twenty, or a hundred "languages"—how many I don't know!

"Equality of opportunity!" Yes, we have the equality of opportunity to starve together, not to make a living together.

In regard to education and other things, let me give you just a few figures and that will suffice. India under our benign British government spends 2 per cent of the entire revenue of the country on agriculture and industry and 3.6 per cent on the medical and public health department, on education 7.2 per cent, and on defense 31.4 per cent of the entire revenue of the country. That gives you an idea of the solicitude which our British rulers have for the peasantry, for the education and the sanitation of our starving people. These figures are taken from the Simon Report.

Now let me give you one or two things in regard to cow-killing and Hindu-Moslem trouble. One illustration would do. In the city of Bombay the municipality brought up a resolution that cow-killing should be prohibited within the environments of the Bombay municipality. At first the Bombay government permitted the municipality to discuss the measure. It was thought the Hindus and Moslems would not be able to agree, but the miracle happened. We did agree and joined hands. "Surely we will agree with you, and there shall be no cow-killing within the limits of the Bombay municipality," said the Moslem members of the municipality. But what happened? The Bombay government said, "This will not be applicable to the British soldiers who are stationed here and the cows may be killed at the cantonments for the beef that the British soldiers may want to eat."

Immediately the Hindus and Mohammedans said, "No, we shall not pass it. We shall not pass this ordinance. We shall permit cow-killing because we do not want favoritism shown the British soldier as against the Mussulman."

Finally, may I speak of this one very important point regarding the representative character of the Round Table Conference, or its unrepresentative character. May I draw your attention to the fact which Mr. Strickland forgot to mention, I am afraid, that the Viceroy deliberately sent out his emissaries to Mahatma Gandhi behind prison bars in Yerawada, with this message, "The Congress will be given preponderant representation at the Round Table Conference if only you consent to come and bless the Round Table."

Gandhi said he would go to it on one condition only, namely that the purpose of the Round Table Conference shall be the framing of the Swaraj Constitution. We do not want to discuss whether we are fit for Swaraj; pin yourselves down to the fact that your purpose shall be the working out of the Swaraj Constitution.

And as to the Congress being a Hindu body alone, I should know better about it than Mr. Strickland. He has been away from India for some time. I was there only four months ago and I tell you the Moslems in India are taking a much more vigorous part in the present campaign for

independence than the Hindus themselves. I am a Hindu and I make this statement as a Hindu.

THE CHAIRMAN: Miss Sorabji!

MISS SORABJI: I am most grateful for this additional time in which to answer my valiant accusers. To begin with, I want to explain a misapprehension. I had to speak so quickly that I could not enlarge my point about Hinduism being caste. I am perhaps a student of Hinduism who has had more opportunities than any of the speakers at this table and more opportunities for study than many Indians all over India, because for twenty years I have been the friend and adviser of orthodox Hindus in three provinces and I am still the friend and adviser of orthodox Hindus all over the country. I want to add this, that the women in India conserve Hinduism, not the men, so they know more about it even than the men. What I meant was this, that orthodox Hinduism is based on caste. To the orthodox Hindu the man who throws away caste is not a Hindu. I do not mean to say that Hinduism does not include a beautiful philosophy or has not many beautiful thoughts in it; but I simply mean that the orthodox Hindus who form the majority, would count a man who had thrown away caste, who had eaten with us, or with a Moslem, as not a Hindu; and that will be one of the big difficulties in India.

My point was that a man who had thrown away the chief thing which belonged to Hinduism could not make promises in the name of the people who clung to that thing. That is why I cannot help counting the promises made by the progressive Indians, to Dr. Ambedkar as a little indiscreet. Who is going to help fulfillment of that promise?

You have an instance in regard to social laws. It is a very difficult question to understand. I beg you to give your minds to this, i.e. to the problems between the progressives and the orthodox. "Hindu" is a term both of race and religion, and we get into fogs when we confuse the term applicable to religion with the term applicable to the race. The progressive (racial Hindu) Indians who make the majority of the legislative assemblies of the Council pushed through the Sarda Bill relating to the marriage of children. Did the orthodox Hindus agree? No. What did they do? They married their children as swiftly as they could all over the country some of them at the ages of one, two, and three; and how are you going to get enforcement of that Act? Are you going into the house of a Hindu to say, "What age is that child?"

Who dare go into the house of an orthodox Hindu? It will be frightfully difficult to police that Act. Equally will there be difficulty with the suggestion that the new Indian government will secure entry to the temples by the outcasts. Who can compel that? How can you interfere with a religion in its personal aspects? Even when there is a state religion, the

state cannot interfere with that religion except in matters relating to the constitution; and there is no state religion in India. That will be a terribly difficult question.

Then as to sanitation: The progressives wish one thing and the orthodox Hindus another. I have seen this in practice in municipalities where progressives and orthodox have come together. The progressives want to put in a new system of sanitation dealing with drainage. The orthodox say, "You are taking decayed vegetable matter into the Sacred River Ganges."

"But," say the progressives, "you put decaying human matter into the Ganges."

"Yes," they say, "but decaying vegetable matter is not mentioned in the Shastras. Decaying human matter is."

How are you to deal with a situation like that?

Now one more example. The Indian born an Indian, although he may have thrown away some of his customs, if he is born into one of the lower castes, still keeps in his mind the fear of the Brahmin. The other day in India, a Hindu friend of mine who was of the Vaisya caste, that is, the third caste, asked me to help him to stand as sheriff, to tell my friends he was up, and ask them to vote for him. That was legitimate, I could say "so and so is up, do go to the polls and don't forget to vote"; but he withdrew before the election. I said, "Why did you?"

"Because XYZ, who is a Brahmin, said, 'I am going to stand for this,' and I withdrew. How could I oppose a Brahmin?"

As to education, certainly the figures are low, but why? It is because we are not yet at the place where we desire education all over the country. Remember our three hundred and twenty millions, remember our area, which is half the size of the United States with three times the population; and all this education is a new thing, not only because of the caste difficulties, but because of other things. Remember that; and remember that over and over again when the government has brought in a bill for compulsory education, it has been thrown out by Hindu or Moslem.

The other day in my own province a Moslem Minister brought in a bill for compulsory education. It was thrown out by the Hindu Minister. That is another opposition you will get. What one brings in is opposed by the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is just possible that the Chair in his wisdom may extend the time for a minute or two if the discussion is lively and to the point. Where is the first question?

PROFESSOR SHEPPARD: May I direct this question to Miss Sorabji? *In view of the substantial unity of sentiment among the representatives of India, if not of the Indian people, at the London Conference in favor of dominion status, does Miss Sorabji not overstate her case against her countrymen when she favors the maintenance of British rule in virtually its present form?*

MISS SORABJI: I can't remember having spoken of the maintenance of British rule in its present form. I talked of the practical autonomy which is offered to Indians under the Simon Report. I want it remembered that the gift of Indian self-government is a British gift to India, that the King offered that to us unasked after the War, and implemented his promise by giving us the first instalment in 1919. We are being offered a second instalment now, in ten years' time. What that second instalment will be had to be decided by Indians and English together. The proposal under the Act was to be stated first by the Statutory Commission. The Statutory Commission has practically offered us autonomy. Autonomy for the provinces and a central federal control does look to me like self-government. There are a few details about defense which do not matter.

The next move was to be by the Indians; but the Indians did not tell the government what they wanted either in India or in England, nor have they themselves framed a constitution, which was Lord Birkenhead's express request to them, if they did not agree with what England was offering them. The position therefore is this: England having asked them to tell what they wanted in India, and having been met with non-cooperation, led by Mahatma Gandhi, has invited them to England to say what they want at the Round Table Conference, now sitting in London. Whether you call the offer of England dominion status (which has no legal definition), or independence, or whatever you call it, it will be self-government.

What I favor is what the King offered, progressive self-government within the Empire. Anybody who loves India knows that it must be *progressive* if we are to succeed, and I want us to succeed. I don't want us to have an impossible task and get disheartened over it. Anybody who knows India and our terrible position both within India and in regard to external possibilities, can only wish that it will be self-government within the Empire.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a question first addressed to Mr. Andrews. *It is this: Has India cut down her export of opium and to what extent? Is the export eventually to be done away with? Then there seems to be a second part of the question: To what extent has the abuse of opium in the interior of India been curtailed?*

MR. ANDREWS: External opium is being cut down by 10 per cent per annum and that is being carried out. It ends at the year 1935. With regard to internal consumption, there has been serious omission on the part

of the government of India in carrying out the people's program. There are many very serious black spots in India. Committees have been appointed by the government but those black spots still remain, especially that terrible evil in Bombay by which children are doped with opium by their mothers. That is still going on today.

There is also in India with regard to internal consumption a very serious evil of smuggled opium from the Indian states especially the Rajputana states. The actual amount needed to put an end to that by a compromise with the states by which they should no longer produce opium in their own states would mean a sum of about $2,500,000. That sum has not been provided, though for years and years the Indian government has been taking huge sums of money, running into many millions of rupees from the sale and monopoly of opium bought internally and externally.

With regard to those who have brought pressure on the Indian government which has made possible the progress that has already taken place, probably there are two chief parties in that pressure. One is the American public. The government of India has done more in the way of reform both internally and externally on account of the pressure of the American public than through possibly any other cause, but lately the other cause has grown enormously, namely, the pressure of Indian public opinion led chiefly by Mahatma Gandhi; and in the last two years that pressure has been tremendous. During this year, probably never before in history has the British government so felt the pressure of popular opinion in India as at the present moment.

That is as quickly as I can give the present position of opium in India.

THE CHAIRMAN: As so often happens with questions of that sort, one answer does not seem to be sufficient. Mr. Strickland will say a word or two.

MR. STRICKLAND: Very briefly I want to make clear that the control of opium in the provinces is in the hands of the ministers who are drawn from the elected representatives and who are Indians. It rests with the provincial council and with the minister to control, and, if necessary, stop, totally prohibit, the use of opium at any moment. It does not rest with British authorities at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Muzumdar!

DR. MUZUMDAR: Mr. Strickland is quite right that the opium is now in the hands of the Indian ministers, but the Indian minister is between the devil and the deep sea. He also has what we call the Transfer Department, Education, and Sanitation. If he wants to promote education and sanitation, the only thing he can do is impose more taxation and promote a greater consumption of opium. Well, there you are!

QUESTION: *As a student of human psychology, I have one question to ask which has been troubling my mind and also the minds of a great number of people in this country. We simply cannot understand what can bring a person at considerable expense from another country to visit a foreign shore to decry his or her own country. We could understand an Englishman's coming to this country and speaking of the incapacity and viciousness of the Indian people, but when an Indian comes at her own expense to do it, we cannot understand it. If an American were to go at his expense or the expense of others behind him to India to express hatred against Americans, we would be surprised.*

THE CHAIRMAN: The question, as well as I could make it out—it was clearly put, but the Chair was not completely undisturbed during the course of the question—was addressed, perhaps not directly, but by inference to Miss Sorabji, and it started on a psychological note and seemed to me to slip into a personal note, and the substance of it was why Miss Sorabji comes to America to, as the questioner thought, decry her own people, and there was something about expenses in the question, which Miss Sorabji may refer to or not as she elects.

MISS SORABJI: I don't know about psychology, but I hardly think according to the manners to which I am accustomed, that this is a question allowable in a public discussion.

As a matter of fact I came to this country unexpectedly and at great inconvenience to myself because I was invited by the Institute of Politics at Williamstown to speak in the conference on India. I had proved my devotion to my country by over thirty-five years of service in that country, and I was glad to be of any further use to my country even in a foreign land.

I have stayed on since the conference at Williamstown also in response to expressed invitations from the American people to speak to them in other places about India.

I have answered the question—but I am a free person of a free country, and why I am here happens to be my own business. I must confess to a prejudice in favor of the manners to which I am accustomed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am just reminded it is always easy to conduct an F. P. A. meeting because the Chairman never can make a mistake without being reminded of it. He never can forget anything without being reminded of it, either, and I am reminded that this is not the last Foreign Policy Association meeting, that there is going to be another meeting on December 6th, and the subject is "The European Scene." I understand, however, that artists are not to be the speakers. There are to be two speakers, one a distinguished Englishman, the Deputy Director of the In-

ternational Labor Office, and the other the Chairman of today. Mr. Bruce Bliven is to maintain peace and order.

There is a question addressed to Dr. Muzumdar: *How do you propose to defend India if you dismiss British officers at once?*

DR. MUZUMDAR: We are not anxious to dismiss British officers immediately. If they will do the policing for us, we would be glad to pay the wages that are their due, but if they want to rule us, we certainly do not want them to remain in India.

The question is asked how India proposes to defend herself if England goes away. The answer to that question in the first place is that England herself has made us incompetent to defend ourselves. To this day the King's commission has been held by no more than a handful of Indians, and even this meager concession was made only after the War broke out. Until that time all the King's commissions were reserved for the British officers alone, and during the War when India rendered meritorious service, the King was pleased to confer a few commissions upon Indians. You ask me concerning defense: Mr. Lloyd George is on record as having said it was the bravery of the Indian soldiers in France that was responsible for stemming the advancing tide of Germans upon Paris. If the Indian soldiers could do that in a foreign country, do you imagine they could not do it in defense of their own motherland?

Practically speaking, we are perfectly willing to make an arrangement. It should be an arrangement between equal and equal, and not as between a superior and an inferior. If we can in the meantime get the services of British officers for a stipulated amount of price, we are perfectly willing to accept it. We do not hate the Englishman, but we should prefer chaos in India to British rule any longer.

THE CHAIRMAN: *There is a question here addressed to Mr. Strickland which comes from a new book on India, a book by Dr. Will Durant, who says in his book, according to this questioner, that there have been 20,000 Englishmen tried for murdering Indians during British rule, and in no single instance was an Englishman convicted by the British courts. Is this true, and, if not, do you know of a single instance where an Englishman has been convicted?*

MR. STRICKLAND: I am afraid I have not in my possession the exact figures of prosecution of Englishmen for either murder or culpable homicide in the course of British rule in India. I cannot say what the exact figure is. I should say however, that I think 20,000 enormously exaggerates the number of Englishmen who have committed murder or culpable homicide.

Do I know actual instances where they have been convicted? I remem-

ber one, two, three, four, five, within my personal memory, and, of course, I am speaking there of only a limited part of the country. There have been lots of others. I will be quite frank, I am not prepared to disagree with Mr. Andrews when he says that there has been a reluctance sometimes on the part of Indian judges to convict Englishmen, but the representation made by Dr. Durant, in a totally ill-informed book that I don't recommend you to read, is altogether wrong.

THE CHAIRMAN: Evidently this meeting could go on indefinitely without reaching that complete unanimity that the Chairman anticipated at the beginning, so, expressing your appreciation to all the speakers, I declare the meeting adjourned.

For further information, read . . .

THE CRISIS IN INDIA: ITS CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS

This timely F. P. A. INFORMATION SERVICE report presents the background of events which tie up directly with the present situation and the Round Table Conference in London. Special emphasis has been placed on constitutional development in British India and on the growth of the Nationalist movement. There is a further brief section on the present day structure of Indian society and government. *Single copies 25c.*

In preparation:

THE CRISIS IN INDIA: ITS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL BASIS

Other reports dealing with British Empire problems:

THE RACE PROBLEM IN SOUTH AFRICA
THE NEAR EAST IN 1928
THE PALESTINE CONFLICT
IRAQ AND THE BRITISH TREATIES
EGYPT IN 1930

Complete list of titles free on request

Yearly subscription to the INFORMATION SERVICE

F. P. A. members $3.00
Non-members 5.00

Membership in the Foreign Policy Association $5.00 a year